

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**Interview Agenda:**

- Discussion of current §101 rejections;
- Discussion of differences between the application/claims and the cited references; and
- Discussion of proposed amendments

**MAY 28 2008**

**Section 101**

**[0002]** Would we eliminate the § 101 issues if I amend claim 22 to model after claim 28 as suggested on p. 4 of the Office Action. In particular, I propose amending the preamble of claim 22 as follows:

A system implemented at least in part by a computing device, the computing device comprising one or more tangible computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program executed by one or more processors, the system comprising:

**[0003]** If these proposed amendments will not overcome the current §101 rejections, I would like to discuss suggestions you may have for additional amendments that would overcome the current §101 rejections.

**Differences Between the Application and the Cited References**

**[0004]** It does not appear to me that the primary cited reference (i.e., Willebeek-LeMair) discloses the following (in particular, the emphasized text) from claim 1:

A method comprising:  
receiving an event from a first security engine;  
identifying a second security engine configured to utilize information contained in the even, ***wherein the second***

MAY 28 2008

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file

***security engine is unaware of the first security engine;***  
and

communicating the information contained in the event to the second security engine, wherein the event corresponds to identifying a password that does not comply with predetermined criteria.

**[0005]** Instead, Willebeek-LeMair describes an intrusion detector functionality 116 [i.e. the first security engine] and a firewalling functionality 118 [i.e. the second security engine] being interlocked such that the firewalling functionality 118 [i.e. the second security engine] can take alerts generated by the intrusion detector functionality 116 [i.e. the first security engine]. Nothing in Willebeek-LeMair indicates that the intrusion detector functionality 116 [i.e. the first security engine] is unaware of the firewalling functionality 118 [i.e. the second security engine], as described by the invention of claim 1. As to claims 14, 22, and 28, it is believed the same analysis applies thereto.

### **Proposed Amendments**

**[0006]** Please see the attached Appendix of Proposed Claim Amendments. I would like to get your impression how effective the proposed claim amendments might be in our efforts to get allowed subject matter.

**[0007]** Thank you in advance for scheduling time for this interview. I look forward to talking to you.

**INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 28, 2008

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Michael D. Carter  
Reg. No. 56,661  
(509) 324-9256  
[michaelcarter@leehayes.com](mailto:michaelcarter@leehayes.com)  
**www.leehayes.com**

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica  
(509) 324-9256 x264  
**carly@leehayes.com**